

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,966	12/11/2001	Ming-Chang Liu	80398.P466	6361
7:	590 08/12/2004		EXAMINER	
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF,			WONG, ALLEN C	
TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
12400 Wilshire Boulevard			2613	
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
•	10/014,966	LIU ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
•	Allen Wong	2613					
The MAILING DATE of this communication			ess				
Period for Reply		•					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicated. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CION.  CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may tion.  s, a reply within the statutory minimum of the period will apply and will expire SIX (6) May statute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this commandate of the	munication.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	1		•				
•	This action is non-final.						
• •	,—						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application Papers  Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application is/are with some site of the above claim(s) 1-10 is/are allowed.  (a) □ Claim(s) 1-11 and 14-19 is/are rejected.  (b) □ Claim(s) 12 and 13 is/are objected to.  (c) □ Claim(s) 12 and 13 is/are objected to.	ithdrawn from consideration.						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the call 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by			• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received.  uments have been received in e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National St	age				
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Paper No(s)/Mail Date		lo(s)/Mail Date  Informal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)				

Art Unit: 2613

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Objections

1. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: The term "video encoder" should be changed to "computer readable medium". Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-11, 14, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smolenski (6,058,140) and McVeigh (6,574,278).

Regarding claims 1 and 15, Smolenski discloses a computer readable medium and method for encoding a video sequence comprising the steps of:

executing a first phase of motion estimation, the first phase determining a set of field motion vectors (fig.7, element 605 is the motion estimation unit that determines a set of field motion vectors from field data stored in elements 602 and 604); and

using the results of the first phase of motion estimation to execute a 3:2 pulldown detection (col.5, ln.13-16; note a type of 3:2 pulldown detection is done based on results obtained from element 605).

Art Unit: 2613

Although Smolenski does not specifically disclose using scene change detection, however, McVeigh teaches using scene change detection (col.2, ln.35-44; note McVeigh discloses applying motion estimation to gather motion vectors in order to determine scene changes). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Smolenski and McVeigh for properly estimating motion vector information data to accurately encode video image data so as to present the best enhanced images for viewing in a robust, financially fiscal manner (McVeigh col.13, ln.13-37).

Regarding claims 2, 8 and 17, Smolenski discloses wherein: the set of field motion vectors is determined between a first frame and a second frame (col.3, ln.12-25); the first frame having a first field and a second field, the second frame having a first field and a second field (col.3, ln.7-9; a frame must have an even field and an odd field, and comparison between two separate frames is done, as noted in col.3, ln.12-25); and the set of field motion vectors comprises a first set of motion vectors between the first field of the first frame and the first field of the second frame and a second set of motion vectors between the second field of the first frame and the second field of the second frame (col.3, ln.65 to col.4, ln.12).

Regarding claims 5 and 19, Smolenski discloses further comprising: .

executing a 3:2 pulldown detection (col.5, ln.13-16; note a type of 3:2 pulldown detection is done based on results obtained from element 605); if the 3:2

Art Unit: 2613

pulldown detection detects a repeated field, removing the repeated field (col.5, ln.32-36).

Regarding claim 6, Smolenski discloses a video encoder comprising: a motion detection component having a first phase, the first phase to determine a first and second set of motion vectors (fig.7, element 605 is the motion estimation unit that determines a set of field motion vectors from field data stored in elements 602 and 604);

a 3:2 pulldown detection component (col.5, ln.13-16; note a type of 3:2 pulldown detection is done based on results obtained from element 605);

wherein the motion vectors determined by the first phase are used to execute the 3:2 pulldown detection component (col.5, ln.13-16; note a type of 3:2 pulldown detection is done based on results obtained from element 605).

Smolenski does not specifically teach the scene change detection component and executing scene change detection component. However, MCVEIGH discloses the scene change detection component and executing scene change detection component (col.2, ln.35-44; note McVeigh discloses applying motion estimation to gather motion vectors in order to determine scene changes). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Smolenski and McVeigh for properly estimating motion vector information data to accurately encode video image data so as to present the best enhanced images for viewing in a robust, financially feasible manner (McVeigh col.13, ln.13-37).

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claim 9, Smolenski does not specifically disclose wherein the scene change detection component detects a scene change by comparing a ratio of the first and second motion vectors to a threshold. However, McVeigh discloses detects a scene change by comparing a ratio of the first and second motion vectors to a threshold (col.2, ln.32-47; note McVeigh discloses applying motion estimation to gather motion vectors in order to determine scene changes by applying image data comparisons to a threshold). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Smolenski and MCVEIGH for properly estimating motion vector information data to accurately encode video image data so as to present the best enhanced images for viewing in a robust, financially feasible manner (McVeigh col.13, ln.13-37).

Regarding claim 10, Smolenski discloses the video encoder of claim 6, wherein the 3:2 pulldown detection component detects a repeated field by comparing a ratio of the first and second motion vectors to a threshold (col.5, ln.32-36; note comparison of the motion vector data, ie. ratios, must be made to sort out the repeated fields from the non-repeated fields).

Regarding claim 11, Smolenski discloses further comprising a 3:2 pulldown undo component to compensate for finding a repeated field (col.5, ln.13-16; note a type of 3:2 pulldown detection is done based on results obtained from element 605; also see col.5, ln.32-36).

Regarding claim 14, Smolenski discloses the video encoder of claim 6, wherein the encoder is embodied in a processor (col.5, In.23-44; note MPEG-2

Art Unit: 2613

video encoder 300 and redundant frame identification circuit 600 must be processed in a processor).

4. Claims 3, 4, 7, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smolenski (6,058,140) and McVeigh (6,574,278) in view of Lee (5,638,129).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Smolenski and McVeigh do not specifically disclose further comprising executing a second phase of motion estimation. However, Lee teaches that there is a second phase of motion estimation (fig.2, note element 214 is a first phase of motion estimation and a second phase of motion estimation). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Smolenski, McVeigh, and Lee, as a whole, for accurately estimating motion vector information data to encode video image data in an efficient, precise manner so as to display the highest image quality (Lee col.2, In.48-53).

Regarding claims 4, 7 and 18, Smolenski and McVeigh do not specifically disclose wherein executing the second phase of motion estimation further comprises determining: a third set of motion vectors between the first field of the first frame and the second field of the second frame; a fourth set of motion vectors between the second field of the first frame and the first field of the second frame; and a fifth set of motion vectors between the first frame and the second frame. However, Lee discloses obtaining the third, fourth and fifth sets of motion vectors from frame image data (col.6, ln.15-24 and col.6, ln.36-38). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 2613

combine the teachings of Smolenski, McVeigh, and Lee, as a whole, for accurately estimating motion vector information data to encode video image data in an efficient, precise manner so as to display the highest image quality (Lee col.2, In.48-53).

## Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art does not specifically teach "wherein the 3:2 pulldown undo component compensates for finding a repeated field by replacing the repeated field with a reference to a field from which the repeated field is repeated." The prior art also does not specifically teach "wherein the 3:2 pulldown undo component compensates for finding a repeated field by averaging the repeated field and a field from which the repeated field is repeated."

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen Wong whose telephone number is (703) 306-5978. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Thursdays from 8am-6pm.

Art Unit: 2613

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Allen Wong Examiner

Art Unit 2613

AW 8/9/04